

REMARKS

Claims 11 and 13 are canceled without prejudice, and therefore claims 10, 12 and 14 to 22 are now pending in the present application.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable for at least the following reasons.

With respect to paragraph five (5) of the Final Office Action, Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 13 to 15 and 19 to 22 contain allowable subject matter. While it is believed that the base claims are allowable as previously explained, to facilitate matters, the features of claims 11 and 13 (which are canceled without prejudice) have been included in claim 10, so that claim and its dependent claims 12, 14, 15, and 17 to 22 are allowable. Like wise, the features of original claim 10 and claim 11 have been included in claim 16, so that claim 16 is now allowable. It is therefore respectfully requested that the objections be withdrawn.

With respect to page two (2), claims 10 to 12, 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,907,540 to "Hayashi" (the "Hayashi" reference) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,848,054 to Mosebrook et al. (the "Lau" reference).

For a claim to be rejected for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), not only must the prior art disclose or suggest each element of the claim, but the prior art must also suggest combining the elements in the manner contemplated by the claim. See Northern Telecom, Inc. v. Datapoint Corp., 908 F.2d 931, 934 (Fed. Cir. 1990), cert. denied, 111 S. Ct. 296 (1990); In re Bond, 910 F.2d 831, 834 (Fed. Cir. 1990). The Examiner bears the initial burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. M.P.E.P. §2142. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Examiner must show that there is some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify or combine the references and that, when so modified or combined, the prior art teaches or suggests all of the claim limitations. M.P.E.P. §2143.

While it is believed that the rejected claims are allowable as previously explained, to facilitate matters, and as explained above, the features of claims 11 and 13 (which are canceled without prejudice) have been included in claim 10, so that claim 10, as presented, and its dependent claims 12 and 17 are allowable. Like wise, the features of original claim 10 and claim 11 have been included in claim 16, so that claim 16 is now allowable. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn.

With respect to page three (3), claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,907,540 to "Hayashi" (the "Hayashi" reference) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,848,054 to Mosebrook et al. (the "Lau" reference) as applied to claim 10, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,369,745 to Faber.

Claim 18 depends from claim 10 as presented, and is therefore allowable for the same reasons as claim 10 as presented, which includes the allowable subject matter of canceled claims 11 and 13, since the "Faber" reference does not cure the critical deficiencies of the primary references.

Accordingly, claims 10, 12, and 14 to 22 are allowable.

CONCLUSION

It is therefore respectfully submitted that claims 10, 12 and 14 to 22 of the present application are allowable. It is therefore respectfully requested that the objections and rejections be withdrawn. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 11/10/2007

By: Gerard A. Messina

Gerard A. Messina
Reg. No. 35,952

KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200

CUSTOMER NO. 26646